

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

JEREMIAH WILLIAM BALIK,
Plaintiff,
v.
CITY OF LAS VEGAS, et al.,
Defendants.

Case No.: 2:21-cv-01701-RFB-NJK

ORDER

[Docket No. 13]

Pending before the Court is Plaintiff's motion to proceed *in forma pauperis*. Docket No. 13. Plaintiff submits that he was allowed to proceed *in forma pauperis* in this action in Nevada state court prior to its removal to this Court. *Id.* at 3-4. Plaintiff therefore asks this Court to allow him to proceed *in forma pauperis* so that he can apprise himself of service by the United States Marshals pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4(c)(3). *Id.* at 1-4.

Defendants have removed the instant case to this Court and paid the filing fee. Docket No. 1. Plaintiff fails to demonstrate that it is proper for the Court to make an *in forma pauperis* determination for a non-moving, or non-filing, party. Further, Plaintiff fails to file an application to proceed *in forma pauperis* on this Court's required form. *See* Docket. While *pro se* filings must be construed more liberally than those filed with the assistance of counsel, *see Blaisdell v. Frappiea*, 729 F.3d 1237, 1241 (9th Cir. 2013), the Court only considers well-developed arguments. *See Kor Media Grp., LLC v. Green*, 294 F.R.D. 579, 582 n.3 (D. Nev. 2013).

Accordingly, the Court **DENIES** Plaintiff's motion without prejudice. Docket No. 13. Any future motion must be supported by supporting points, authorities, and argument demonstrating that it is proper for the Court to enter an order allowing Plaintiff to proceed *in forma*

1 *pauperis* under the circumstances of this case. Additionally, any future request must include a
2 complete application to proceed *in forma pauperis* using this Court's standard form, which can be
3 found on the Court's website.

4 IT IS SO ORDERED.

5 Dated: October 22, 2021

6
7 
8 _____
9 Nancy J. Koppe
10 United States Magistrate Judge
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28